



280.

Jan. 3. 1875.

Dear Mr. Hooker

Le Soc.

As you have referred to me the year in which
the publication was given in a subsequent number of
the Journ. of Botany, I will add the following
in the next of Proceedings. If you can not find a copy, you
will let me know.

The consignment of Her's plants arrived in Ceylon when
Tweddle was already past. Consequently, as he had no
time for receiving the plants. It is very difficult to find the date
of arrival which was to be a great service to Tweddle during
his stay.

But there is no doubt that Ceylon received two consignments
plants, one in 1876 and the other in 1877. It is also certain
that so far as known either was one of the planters at Matara or
whether they were received in a separate batch. But, as whether the second
consignment was received in January. We suppose that the
trees at Matara are the arrival of both consignments and
therefore may be sent from Matara. So is Matara
likely to be received from Ceylon trees as you want this.

We sent 400 tubs to Singapore in a wooden case in 1875,
and 115 in 1876 in boxes. The latter date is given by
pp. 66 in Ceyl. Botanic Gardens Report for 1881 & 1888, a Trin. species

But is not all this somewhat superfluous as far as the Singapore trees are concerned. Singapore received plants direct from New in 1876. Ridley says these are trees but Hunter said they are not. Another consignment was sent direct to Singapore in 1877. So Singapore, like Ceylon, received plants of both consignments.

We have always regarded the second consignments to Ceylon and Singapore as Ross's trees. But quite recently, Hunter states that it was no secret that Ross's plants never became fit to send out.

Trivel's statement on which you quote was based on data supplied by Dyer in 1883 or 1884. He is the one who did not inform Trivel that the second lot were Ross's trees, but on the other hand he stated "the trees cross sown we had done with them"; "we saved the true cross sown we had done with them"; "we saved a small a warden case full to do justice to Ross". As such, I think the plants in Dyer's collection now, as is apparent to me where the plants comes from, especially if they were distributed by him.

The extraordinary thing about this introduction of *Persea* is that New never wrote any account of it. After furnishing data to Trivel, he wrote his account of 1881, & when in 1896 (?) new published a history of coffee cultivation, very simply adopted Trivel's version. B96/2

There are difficulties. And they are not lessened by the fact that Dyer, who claims to have been in charge of the whole operation, never tells the name of the trees. Both he & Ridley know the various consignments of plants, number & parts. They state that the second & smallest were Ross's trees. This causes no objection, but consider especially the statement, that in no generation of the trees did Ross ever sell any plants to the East.

Of course, this is, as usual, a "select" history of this. It may be due to the introduction of *Persea*, & subsequently to the possession of the. They appear to have worked together closely, at first, but a love affair about 1875. Lockhart, in his notes, says that he was off a man, and it is interesting to note that Ross was responsible for this affair, Lockhart's wife.

The New Report is not very cross examine, but my purpose is as far as possible. Dyer, in 1881, wrote that "this plant" introduced by him to the East Indies "is cultivated". I find it difficult to suppose that Dyer would have given less away about it if he could have avoided it, for I may tell you, in confidence, that Dyer's idea of *Persea* probably is most ridiculous.

That Dyer idea of *Persea* probably is most ridiculous, I might add. It is ridiculous, because it is impossible to suppose in position of the two men.

But any defects above the main body, and
the Cross's head may have given the idea
we have to copy, and so on. The main idea is
certain. The main machine was made in
Cuba, and of course the Cross is -
of circumstantial evidence.

Yours sincerely

John D. Morris

13th April, 1915.

Dear Mr. Burkill,

Mr. LeGoc. has referred to me your query re Cross's Hevea. We published last year a complete account of all we know about the introduction of Hevea into Ceylon in the Annals of Peradeniya. If you did not receive a copy, will you let me know.

Both consignments of Hevea plants arrived in Ceylon when Thwaites was almost past work. Consequently we have very few records relating to them. It may be said that their location at Henaratgoda was due in great measure to Thwaites increasing infirmities.

But there is no doubt that Ceylon received two consignments of plants, one in 1876 and the other in 1877. It is also certain that no one knows whether these were both planted at Henaratgoda, whether they were planted in separate blocks there, or whether the second consignment was retained at Peradeniya. We suppose that the trees at Henaratgoda are the survivors of both consignments and therefore any seed sent from Henaratgoda is almost as likely to be descended from Cross's trees as from Wickham's.

~~We sent 400 seeds to Singapore in a Wardian case in 1885, and 11500 seeds in bags in 1888.~~ The latter date is fixed by the Ceylon Botanic Gardens Reports for 1887 & 1888, and Trimen's diaries. But is not all this somewhat superfluous as far as the Singapore trees are concerned. Singapore received plants direct from Kew in 1876. Ridley says these all died but Murton said they did not. Another consignment was sent direct to Singapore in 1877. So Singapore, like Ceylon, received plants of both consignments.

We have always regarded the second consignments to Ceylon and Singapore as Cross's trees. But quite recently Kew has stated that it has no record that Cross's plants ever became fit to send out.

Trimen's statement which you quote was based on data supplied by Dyer in 1880 or 1881. It is true that Dyer did not inform Trimen that the second lot were Cross's trees, but on the other hand he stated "By the time Cross arrived we had done with Hevea"; "we saved I think a Wardian caseful to do justice to Cross". As they gave half the plants to Bull of Chelsea, it is difficult to see where the justice comes in, especially if they never distributed his plants.

396/3

The extraordinary thing about this introduction of Hevea is that Kew never wrote any account of it. Dyer furnished data to Trimen who wrote his account of 1881, and when in 1896(?) Kew put out a history of rubber cultivation, they simply adopted Trimen's version. Hence our difficulties. And they are not lessened by the fact that Dyer, who claims to have been in charge of the whole operations, never tells the same tale twice. Both he and Ridley show an amazing disregard of dates, numbers, and facts. Trimen stated that the second consignments were Cross's trees; Kew raised no objection, but actually adopted the statement; now the new generation at Kew claims that Cross's trees were never sent to the East.

Of course, there is, as usual, a "backstair" history of this. The India office began the introduction of Hevea, and subsequently sought the assistance of Kew. They appear to have worked together amicably at first but to have differed about 1875. Wickham was Kew's man: Cross was the India office man. And it is interesting to note that Cross was despatched for Hevea after Wickham's arrival.

The Kew Reports do not deny Cross's assistance, but they minimise it as far as possible. Dyer, in 1878, wrote that Cross's plants "contributed but little to our resources for distribution". I find it difficult to suppose that Dyer would have given Cross any credit if he could have avoided it, for I may tell you, in confidence, that Dyer's letters to Trimen exhibit a most virulent animosity towards Cross. It is ludicrous, considering the difference in position of the two men. But any definite evidence that the second consignments were Cross's could only have been furnished by Kew. We have no covering letter so far as I have been able to ascertain. The fact that they were sent with the Ceara trees, which of course were Cross's, is a piece of circumstantial evidence.

Yours sincerely,

(sl)) T. FETCH.

ba.6/4